ages, and Cæsarianus referred in the same sentence to the learning of Cordova, and the writings of Aristotle. It was to be noticed, that Cæsarianus was an advocate for competition, for he had said, if a competition had been decided upon, "our hecuba" would have been sooner completed.—Mr. Cockerell concluded the lecture with some curious information on the use of the name architect, which was never general till the sixteenth century. Previous to that period that officer was merely "the master," though he had been clearly pointed to in certain passages in the Bible. Shakespeare said:—"Consult surveyors, know our own estate;" but in Titus Andronicus he said, "Chief architect, and plotter of these woes." The concealment of the names of most of the medieval architects was accounted for by the fact, that individual fame was never an object, every exertion was directed to the one end of erecting a noble fabric to the glory of the Almighty.

ROSLIN COLLEGIATE CHURCH.

Sir,—By your last number, I learn that Mr. Roberts brought before the members of the Architects' Institute some remarks on the paper I read there on the 12th of last month. As I was not present at that meeting, and my statement or judgment is impeached, I beg you will do me the justice to give insertion to the following brief remarks in self-justification. On quoting the following lines from Sir Walter Scott's "Lay of the Last Minstrel," I said there were almost as many errors, or mis-statements, as lines; at the same time passed a high eulogium on the commanding talents of that accomplished author. Before reading the stanzas I observed, "This building, as well as most of the old edifices of the country, has some marvellous story, or silly romance, or incredible legend connected with it. Such matters may serve as themes to embellish or diversify the stanzas of a poem, the pages of a novel, or the annals of a fabulous chronicle, but are unworthy of notice by the architectural antiquary, or philosophical historian. The following lines by that most imaginative novelist, Sir Walter Scott, are quoted not to afford any architectural or historical information, but to shew the general 'fictions' and fallacies of poetry:"—

"—— Seemed all on fire, that *chapel* proud,
Where Roslin's chiefs *uncoffin'd* lie;
Each baron for a sable shroud,
Sheathed in his *iron* panoply.
Seem'd all on fire within, around,
Deep *sacristy* and altar's pale;
Shone *every pillar foliage* bound,
And *glimmered* all the dead men's *mail*:
Blazed *battlement*, and *pinnet* high,
Blazed every rose-carved buttress fair;
So still they blaze, when fate is nigh
The lordly line of high St. Clair."

Although there are not quite so many errors or mis-statements as lines, the number of words in italics shew that they are very nearly so. The building is not a *chapel*; it was erected and founded for a collegiate *church*, and had it been completed, would have been a large and splendid edifice. The best authorities that I have consulted do not say any thing of *uncoffin'd* chiefs in *iron* panoply; nor is it likely that such ever could be allowed. Putrified dead bodies would have excluded living ones from the church. There is no appearance of *sacristy*. Instead of *every pillar foliage bound*, there is only one thus adorned; and this has given origin to a puerile story, which the old female cicerone of the building may repeat and believe, though none but an old woman will give two moments' credence to. I believe there are not any *battlements* to the building, and I do not know that the word *pinnet* is either architectural or archæological.

Let it not be imagined by the reader that I make these remarks with any ungenerous or unkind feelings towards the author of the inimitable "Waverley Novels," whom I had the pleasure and honour of knowing and corresponding with in life, and whose memory and merits I revere, in death. His works have been read and admired by millions of people, and have afforded me, with other readers, indescribable gratification and delight. The youthful reader should, however, be warned against errors, mis-statements, and misrepresentations even of popular authors.

In the paper I read at the Architects' Institute, it appears from Mr. Roberts's remarks, that I was not sufficiently explanatory about the *extraordinary construction* of the eastern wall, and the alterations effected by rebuilding it after it had been once raised. I certainly did not make any comments or criticisms on Mr. Roberts's ingenious and original theory; but intimated that I agreed with him in believing the wall does not occupy the site as at first planned and intended by the architect. It occurred to me on a cursory consideration of the subject, that the whole plan had been marked out on the ground, from the "*draughts drawn on eastland boards*," which were "*carved by the carpenters*" as described in Father Hay's MSS., and that when the masons had carried up the walls and pillars of the whole building to a certain height, and had also *prepared* much of the superstructure, particularly those remarkable stone beams, or lintels which extend over the aisles, and their connecting vaultings, the architect discovered that the space at the east end, between the easternmost pillars and the wall, was not wide enough for the religious services at the four altars, placed under so many windows in that wall. This I believe is Mr. Roberts's opinion, and I do not feel inclined to doubt, much less to dispute it. But as the subject is very curious, and perhaps unparalleled in architectural construction, I would recommend a careful examination of the eastern wall in conjunction with those on the north and south sides, and particularly the positions and formation of the angular buttresses. Further, let the ground be excavated and explored, to ascertain if there be any remains of foundation between the present eastern wall and the three pillars.

For good illustrations of the fragment of the singular Collegiate church at Roslin, I refer the inquisitive antiquary to the third volume of "*The Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain*," in which there is a ground-plan and several other engravings of views, elevations, sections, and details; to "*The Provincial Antiquities of Scotland*," in which there are two beautiful prints from drawings by Mr. Blore, with a short account of the building by that architect. Mr. Edward Cresy, architect, has given two very interesting sectional engravings of the same edifice, in his fragment of a work on Bridges, &c.

I am, Sir, yours, &c., John Britton.

FALL OF A VIADUCT ON THE ROUEN AND HAVRE RAILWAY.

In our impression of the 24th ultimo we noticed this accident, and promised to revert to it. The cause of the catastrophe is still enveloped in mystery. The contractors, Messrs. Mackenzie and Brassey "are disposed to attribute it to the substitution (with Mr. Locke's approbation) of stone-work in the bases of the piers for the brick-work prepared in the original plan." This alteration was made at their request with a view to accelerate the progress of the works. It appears that the whole work was of brick excepting the bases of the piers, which were of stone, the arches were semicircular, and of ample strength; on the day before the accident not the slightest flaw had been discovered in any part of the brick-work, but vertical cracks near the corners had been observed in the stone-work. This stone-work was ashlar facing, hearted with rubble. Uniting these facts with the additional ones of some haste being made in the erection, and a great deal of rain having fallen, both during the progress of the works and since, a very reasonable inference may be drawn as to the origin of the disaster. The *Railway Chronicle*, of last week, has the following remarks on the subject:—

"We must here notice a sort of professional controversy which exists in France between the English engineers and the French. We English like brick-work—we understand it, and we make it good; so good, that from one end to the other of the railway not a single flaw could be detected by the inspector-general in any part of the brick-work of the line. The French engineers do not like brick-work. They are, perhaps, better acquainted with stone, and certainly like it better. Be this as it may, the consequence, as regards this work, has been as follows:—This bridge was originally designed by the engineer and contracted for as *all in brick*. The contractors, partly to expedite the work and partly to please the French engineers, asked leave to make the bases of the piers up to a certain point in stone-work; they obtained the permission of the engineers to do so; and thus, in a desire to expedite the work and to please the French engineers, they have brought on themselves a loss in which we must all sympathize with them, and which we can attribute to nothing but the best intentions. This casualty, while it entails pecuniary loss, will raise the character of the contractors for honesty and responsibility, both here and abroad.

Well, to return to the accident. This stone base was of 10 feet greater diameter than the brick pier resting on it. The chief pressure of the weight of pier and bridge was thus brought to bear on the rubble hearting. The tendency of this to crush the hearting and burst the facing is manifest. The vertical cracks visible that morning in the stone casing were evident symptoms of it; and as the upper work was perfectly sound, and had been some time completed, and as the pile foundations are still perfectly sound as far as can be discerned, the cause is manifest.

The lessons it teaches are also obvious: we are all wise *after* the fact—we can all *now* see that it was weak to yield to an idle prejudice and not use brick throughout as intended—we can all see that it would have been better to wait until the bricks were got than to build work to tumble down! But who would have ventured to say beforehand, to this point you may go, both in haste and in materials, and no further? No! Contractors and engineers must often make sacrifices of mere opinion to accomplish what they conceive their duty to the companies they serve: and if, in doing so, they commit errors, they are but men gaining experience, and they have to pay for it. But in this country, at least, when they bravely set their faces to do their work honestly and well—and when taken as a *whole*, the work is honestly and creditably done, as every thing is that English engineers and English contractors have done in French railroads—they will meet with that sympathy and support from their countrymen which they have a right to expect, and they will be entitled to that respect and esteem abroad which their achievements must command from all right-minded and judicious men."

Cause of Accident on the South Eastern Railway.—We referred to this accident on the 24th ult. (see page 44). Since then a coroner's inquest has taken place, and Mr. Barlow, the resident engineer, gave evidence as to the cause. He attributed the accident to the rush of water from the north (or river) side of the railway, through the occupation-bridge into a ballast-pit on the south side. He was of opinion, however, that the disaster would not have happened had the ballast-pit been full of water at the time. He considered the bridge to have been strong enough to withstand the force of any flood, had it not been for the fall of water which followed on the ballast-pit being nearly empty. This had had the effect of first carrying away a portion of the embankment, and then undermining the foundation of the abutments on which the bridge rested.

The Aust Bridge.—The Admiralty have consented to the intentions of the Bristol and Liverpool Junction Railway Company to erect a suspension bridge across the river Severn. The design submitted is by Mr. Thomas Fulljames. It will reach from a point south of Austhead to an opposite point south of Henchley. There will be three principal openings of 1,100 feet each, three main piers, 60 feet each, and six openings in connection with these piers of 100 feet each. The entire water way will be 4,740 feet. The first principal span will be from Austcliff to the Ulverston Rock, thence to the Lower Bench Rock will be the second principal span, and from this latter position to the Dod Rock will be the third principal span. The *Monmouthshire Merlin*, for the 17th ultimo, gives an engraving of plan and elevation of the proposed structure.

New Houses of Parliament.—The re-appointment of the former committee of the House of Lords to inquire into the progress of the building of the new Houses of Parliament has been agreed to on the motion of the Marquis of Clanricarde.

We learn how to use OCR and PDF Compression visit ThePaperlessOffice.org